

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

PATRICIA SKONIECZNY, JAMES)	
SKONIECZNY, NICOLETTE)	
SKONIECZNY, BRENDA)	
SKONIECZNY, ANNETTE KONARSKI,)	Civil Action No. 08-1312
STANLEY KONARSKI, and NICOLE)	
KONARSKY)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
BOROUGH OF BADEN, JACK SPENCER)	
<i>also known as</i> ALTON J. SPENCER, LYNN)	
KATEKOVICH, ELIZABETH BUTERA,)	
MEDICAL STAFFING ASSOCIATES, INC.,)	
KRISTA POURNARAS, KATERA'S KOVE, INC.)	
)	
Defendants)	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 2nd day of February, 2010, upon review of plaintiffs' motion to amend the complaint (the "Motion") (Docket No. 68), the court finds the Motion lacks sufficient clarity for the court to assess each claim being added, with respect to: 1) which defendants that claim is brought against, 2) the elements of that claim, and 3) the factual allegations supporting those elements. This court on November 18, 2009 denied plaintiffs' prior motion to amend their complaint without prejudice and advised plaintiffs that any renewed motion must contain the detailed information noted in the previous sentence.

If plaintiffs wish to have a motion to amend considered by the court, plaintiffs must file a motion that specifies with clarity each claim being added, which defendants that claim is brought

against, the elements of that claim, and the factual allegations in the proposed amended complaint which support that claim. Failure to comply with these requirements will result in any subsequent motion to amend the complaint being denied with prejudice.

It is **ORDERED** and **DECREED** that plaintiffs' Motion (Docket No. 68) is DENIED without prejudice.

By the court,

February 2, 2010

/s/ JOY FLOWERS CONTI
Joy Flowers Conti
United States District Judge